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Character is an atmosphere rather than a sum of qualities. The great marks of character are teachable-ness and a capacity for growth.

Mandell Creighton

(Life and Letters, II, p. 196)
essential threefold difference that the Anglican Communion is now a worldwide reality; that we know much more about worship in the early centuries than Cranmer and his colleagues could ever boast; and that liturgical work is now shared among Christian Churches that are no longer at daggers drawn with each other. But there are drawbacks to this glorious perspective: it is much more difficult to be part of a Church that wants to remain in Communion with others who live and work and pray within a milieu that seems light-years away from one's own. To know how Christians celebrated the Eucharist in the third century just a little bit better than the Reformers knew it does not necessarily enhance creativity - it can (and does) stifle it. Moreover, ecumenical liturgical work can run the risk of all contemporary international bureaucracy, and settle for flat, bland parlance, that may be acceptable to all but lack the push and the drive of Cranmer at his most poignant.

These essays, therefore, are offered to carry on Anglicanism's conversation with itself, with its sister Churches, and above all with its roots. It is our firm conviction that identity is not something that is self-consciously sought after. It is, rather, a quality of life that emerges with maturity. It is, indeed, an essential feature of the life of a Communion that has, over a period of time, listened to what the Spirit is saying to the Churches. In what is inevitably a vain attempt to put this into the severely practical form of a published book, the editors would like to thank Archbishop Robert Runcie for his encouragement, the contributors for working so hard at their offerings, and the publishers for seeing in our question something worth sifting and striving for.

When Geoffrey Cuming wrote his History of Anglican Liturgy, he followed a quaint tradition in prefacing each chapter with an apt quotation. The eleventh chapter, 'New paths', begins with some words of T.S. Eliot that somehow say it all:

There is only the fight to recover what had been lost
And found and lost again and again: and now, under conditions
That seem unpromising. But perhaps neither gain nor loss.
For us, there is only the trying. The rest is not our business.

T.S. Eliot, East Coker, V^2

Kenneth Stevenson
Bryan Spinks
All Saints' Day, 1990

and blood has something to do with tangible forms of love and charity. Or, to put the point another way, the relations between persons that are of pertinence to their share in Christ’s Body are not abstract, nor are they restricted to the liturgical event. What can be seen in human relations outside the event of worship is allowed to ‘invade’ the language of liturgy.

We are fairly well used to vague petitions about social justice, and so may not see quite why this is surprising. The Communion Orders of 1549, 1552 and 1662 were, of course, political documents in a very strong sense, enforced by Act of Parliament for use in every place of worship in the realm; their authority was coextensive with that of the English Crown. They were not authorized by a Church visibly distinct from the realm, with a different set of laws and distinct class of official interpreters of those laws. Hence, what is enacted in the laws enforcing the use of the Prayer Books is law for both Church and State; for the Church as well as the commonwealth of Christian people living under the rule of the English Crown, and for the State as the political community at worship. The collects for the monarch in the Communion Order bring this home very sharply, but so does the Prayer for the Church Militant, which assumes that the people who are to be ‘godly and quietly governed’ by the Christian Prince are God’s people. This prayer for the ‘Church’ is, once again, telling us that human relations beyond the event of worship, the relations of political order, are matters of the Church’s identity and the Church’s welfare; prayer for the Church is prayer for rulers, pastors, magistrates and (common) people, not for clergy and laity.

It is not that the mediaeval Church declined to pray for secular rulers; we know that some great monastic houses like Christ Church, Canterbury, devoted lengthy prayers each day to the welfare of the royal house. What is new is the idea of praying for secular rulers as — in effect — office-holders in the Church, and to conceive the Church itself as political society. In this place, in this realm, the Church is both the company of all faithful people and that company as organized by the laws of the realm. The discipline of the Church is part of the health of political society, which exists under God’s authority, borne by the monarch, and so must be, as a polity, obedient to God. As J.N. Figgis showed many years ago, the effect of the Reformation, in England as elsewhere, was to remove from the body politic as an alien intrusion the ‘clerk’, as representative of another polity than the king’s.

The Church ceases to be the ensemble of clerks and laity under the supreme magistracy of the Pope: those relations of power and accountability which, for the mediaeval canonist, might be governable by divine law but did not enter into the consideration of what the Church as such was, were now relations within the Body of Christ. Consequently, the abuse and distortion of these relations was a public scandalous wound to the Body. Once again, of course, this is not to say that the mediaeval Church lacked any sense of sin in the public or political order; far from it. But the novelty is in spelling this out as part of the common and tangible definition of active participation in the Body of Christ as a communicant, and in reinforcing this definition and its attendant disciplines by the monarch’s laws.

Communion and responsibility

How should we read all this? Its malign aspects are all too clear. The 1549 and 1552 Books were indeed tools of Tudor ideology, elements of a major political revolution: the notion of a sovereignty independent enough to outbid the Pope’s, the idea — very unmediaeval — of a source of law and right and honour from which the legitimacy of lower-level institutions derived, these things are not hard to find among the pages of the Prayer Books. The Catechism hurries past the unglossed complexities of doctrine to concentrate on what, practically, is owing to God and the social order. None of the Prayer Books could conceivably be a charter for social revolution, and the only appeal from the monarch is to God, to whom alone the monarch is answerable; such an appeal could only ever take the form of passive resistance, a patient commending of one’s cause to the final purposes of God.

But before we write off the polity of the Prayer Book(s) too hastily, I want to ask whether there are less malign influences at work, and whether there are elements we should be reckoning with. My proposal is that we read the Prayer Books as setting out within the context of worship a vision of the Christian commonwealth, a kind of model of the relations which would have to prevail in a society in order for the members of that society to say their prayers honestly. By removing the boundary between Church and social order, it establishes within the rhetoric of the liturgy a recognition of Christ’s sovereignty in this particular place, the place where the liturgy is occurring — which is not just anywhere. It occurs in a place where certain specific patterns of power prevail and where particular abuses in those systems of power are possible (like the unlawful taking away or withholding of goods and lands); and part of the function of the liturgy is for the political community to take cognizance of the authority to which it finally, as a community of Christians, must answer. My question is whether this kind of taking responsibility for Christ in this place and time can survive the dissolution of the monolithic and autocratic order which its Prayer Book form presupposes.

The politics of the Books of 1549, 1552 and 1662 could be seen as a way of ‘imagining the Kingdom’ — providing the materials for an
Anglican believer not only to locate him- or herself in society but to do so with a sense of responsibility to God for its maintenance in justice. Is this part of the job of liturgy? Isn't it in danger of degenerating into the awful human-centred moralizing of some twentieth-century hymns? I think the answer lies precisely in the way the Prayer Books spell out the 'grammar' of responsibility. First and foremost, we take such responsibility in the conviction of the greatness of the claim which God's holiness makes upon us: we cannot begin to understand this without understanding what it means to be accountable to God 'unto whom all hearts be open' and whose majesty is insulted by our lawlessness. Thus our responsibility for 'imagining the Kingdom' in our society and acting upon our imagining, is sustained only by the evocation of that majesty. 'Judge therefore yourselves, brethren, that ye be not judged of the Lord', says the third Exhortation: to come to the sacrament unaware that our unjust and unreconciled and scandalous lives are at odds with the law of God means that we have not grasped the nature of God, and are in mortal peril. We are pretending to be more serious than we are, and that is, at least, a recipe for corruption, for the decomposition of our language and the selves we share in language. To know what seriousness requires, we must be brought up against the greatness of God in the language we use together as Christians.

But at the same time, that discourse about the greatness of God is not the evocation of an empty transcendence — and could not function as the cornerstone of our corporate moral seriousness as a community if it were only that. God's greatness enacts itself as grace — specifically as the invitation to the Lord's Supper; the greatness of God is set aside more decisively by deliberate holding back from Communion than by other sins. 'I bid you in the Name of God, I call you in Christ's behalf, I exhort you as ye love your own salvation, that ye will be partakers of this Holy Communion' says the priest in the second Exhortation of 1662 (and the first of 1552). The majesty of God is there for us, known to us, in the free act of grace which the Supper celebrates. Our accountability to God is made concrete in the form of a specific summons to appear, not at a tribunal, but at 'a rich feast... [where] there lacketh nothing but the guests to sit down'. The test of our seriousness is our willingness to sit in company with each other at 'God's Board', and judgement rests on us if we 'separate from your brethren who come to feed on the banquet of that most heavenly food' — or, in the more vivid words of 1552, 'if ye stand by as gazers and lookers on them that do communicate'. And if we doubt our worthiness to belong in this company, then, as the first Exhortation has told us, we know what to do about it: it is in our hands to repair the breaches of justice and charity which have made us unworthy.

This is not moralism, but a tightly argued morality of worship, a moral discourse informed at every turn by a vision of a holy and gracious God. Our responsibility for a just commonwealth is the same responsibility laid upon us to be partakers of this holy Communion. If we are to respond to the invitation of God, we must in will and deed be answerable for our common life. That it is God who invites, the holy and sovereign God, must reinforce our sense of the danger to which we are exposed by our collusion in the rapacity and fragmentariness of an unjust commonwealth — 'the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions', to quote from a prayer whose original context is political, not ecclesiastical in the limited sense. To repeat and sharpen the point made earlier: the company at the Lord's Table represents a social order; the possibility of sitting together as God's guests is inextricably bound up with the way power and wealth are being used outside the liturgical assembly.

This intensive 'moralizing' of eucharistic participation produced a whole genre of Anglican literature in the shape of manuals for self-examination and preparation for the sacrament. The doubly paradoxical effect of this was the steady decline through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries of the regular celebration of the Lord's Supper, and the literary definition of Anglican piety as the preserve of the literate and more or less leisureed classes, those whose social status gave them the skills and the time to wrestle with the heavy demands of Bishop Lewis Bayly² in the seventeenth century, and other writers of his kind. In the middle distance is the spectacle of the urban Victorian congregation, divided sharply between the leisureed attenders of Morning Service and the unelected and unmonied who were confined to Evensong — a very dramatic inversion of what the policies of the Prayer Book envisage. But if we can see this moralizing process without these unhappy effects for a moment, we may catch a glimpse of a theologically crucial insight which liturgy readily loses sight of.

The Church of God is the anticipation of a redeemed humanity; and this means that the relationships required by life in the Body of Christ are to be the touchstone for human community at large — and specifically for the communities that any one congregation of Christ's people may be involved in at a particular time, in a particular place. Thus the worshipping language of a congregation ought to find some way of articulating this connection, this taking responsibility for and bringing to judgement of a 'commonwealth'. Tudor and Stuart England resolved this, for the most part, by a crude and ideological identification of the social hierarchy, culminating in the figure of the sacralized monarch, with the form of Christian unity; hence the political content of the prayer for unity quoted in the preceding paragraph but one. 'One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all' becomes a legitimation for the political principle of religious conformity and centralized authority [read the prayer with the Catholic martyrs of Elizabeth's
reign in mind, or dissenting ministers who were ejected from their livings after 1662, or John Bunyan or George Fox, and you will understand its moral ambivalence. And this perhaps has something to do with at least two factors: the mediaeval heritage of conceiving the Church’s unity as a legislatively enforceable uniformity (enforceable, that is, by the sanctions of canon law as promulgated by a single supreme magistracy in Rome), and an undialectical understanding of the nature of divine sovereignty (as the extremest possible projection of the absolute right of the monarch in the Renaissance state). And yet, having taken full cognizance of this, the theological point and the theological challenge remain.

Anglicanism, out of all the Churches of the Reformation, linked its fortunes with one nation-state in its formative years. German Lutheranism bound itself to a variety of states, Scandinavian Lutheranism to the nation-states of its region, but theological commitments in these cases extended across political boundaries. The same — eventually — proved true for the Reformed Church in Scotland. But the rationale of the Reformed Church in England was bound to locality. The theme that has been deployed in controversy ever since is the affirmation that the Church of England professes no doctrine but that of the ‘undivided Church’ (i.e. the Church of the early centuries), and claimed simply to be the Catholic Church in this place. Its liturgy is, accordingly, designed for this place; it does not intend to be a universal form of Christian worship. To put it at its most positive, the first Anglican liturgies refuse to consider the Christian congregation in general or in abstract. This, of course, is why the subsequent history of Anglican liturgy has been such a paradox: devotion to the Prayer Book, irrespective of local culture or need, in international Anglicanism until relatively recently, and the canonizing of the Prayer Book as a ‘timeless’ model of worship in so much English Anglicanism. The Prayer Books were meant to bear the imprint of their time and place, and their authoritative and paradigmatic character is in the way in which they set about constructing a language of worship for a non-abstract congregation.

To sum up so far: the specific Anglican contribution to the theology of liturgical construction and reconstruction has to do with the making of liturgy that connects the catholic pattern of life in the Body of Christ with the patterns of community that prevail in this place and time, it is to grasp that part of the task of liturgy is to provide a resource for ‘imagining the Kingdom’ against the specific social and political background, so that the judgement passed by the structures of Christ’s Body on the failed and sinful patterns of an unredeemed or rebellious world may have some chance of being concrete and local. Above all, it assumes that the worshipping congregation is responsible to God for the social patterns in which its members are involved. The genius of the Prayer Books is to perform this liturgical task in a way which does not become human-centred, but continues to evoke the primacy of God’s holiness and generosity.

**Paths for the future**

If I am right in seeing this as a specifically Anglican perspective of liturgy, what follows for the job of liturgy-making in our own day? Very broadly speaking, the Anglican Communion has begun to take on board the question of how to do justice in liturgy to cultural differences, a theme given quite extensive theological treatment in the first report of the International Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission and discussed in various contexts at the 1988 Lambeth Conference. But I am interested here in the rather narrower matter of how liturgy is to articulate a sense of the Kingdom vivid and resourceful enough to act as a point of reference for moral language about human community.

Recent English liturgies have been thin in this respect. The Exhortations having long since vanished; where do we look? The Ten Commandments remain as an option, but are not a very happy way of fulfilling this kind of need — especially as they are generally associated now with an individualistic moralism rather different from the kind of moral comprehensiveness articulated in the first Exhortation. The invitation to confession and the forms of confession themselves are disappointing. The ‘encouraging’ reference to God’s welcoming love is not balanced by any summons to self-examination; we are exhorted to a ‘resolve’ to obey the commandments and to ‘live in love and peace with all men’. But neither in invitation nor confession is there any help in imagining what specific forms of behaviour impede living in love and peace, thus suggesting that what is in question here is more a matter of disposition, goodwill, than action. We intercede for the ‘Church and the world’; experience in more than one parish suggests that prayers for Church-related matters easily swamp the entire intercessory process. This may be inevitable (there’s nothing wrong in praying for what is most immediate to you), but the loss of a prayer which wove together the interests of the worshipping community and the community at large, as did the Prayer for the Church Militant, is worth pondering. The introductions to the Peace remind us of the reality of the Body, but treat this as an occasion for exalting to mutual ‘upbuilding’ rather than any reference to the human community at large.

The Eucharistic Prayers vary in their attention to the themes we have been thinking about. We are reminded that we are a ‘people for [God’s] own possession’; and that the Church is destined in its unity to be ‘a living temple to [God’s] glory’; and the third prayer, while it replete
with bizarre theological archaeologisms (‘was seen on earth’, ‘revealed the resurrection’), at least prays that worshippers will be gathered into the Kingdom. Yet despite its use of one of the most potent early Christian images for the universality of Christ’s saving work (‘he stretched out his arms on the cross’), its prayer for the unity of the Kingdom seems to be restricted to ‘all those who share this one bread and this one cup’.

It is easy and unfair (and too popular a pastime) to list the inadequacies of the Alternative Service Book, while ignoring its strengths: none of what was mentioned in the previous paragraph would be seriously worrying in itself, perhaps, if there were somewhere an articulation of what I have suggested was the classical Anglican insight. In some ways, we have returned to a ‘mediaeval’ liturgy, in which the Church’s relation to the world and the Kingdom has become muted in favour of a concern with the Church’s internal economy. This is not a failing peculiar to the Church of England’s present liturgy; other Anglican and non-Anglican ones suffer in the same way, though some of the often unjustly maligned American Episcopal orders, official and experimental, show signs of recognizing the problem.

It is not a matter simply of criticizing a particular style of prose or a particular set of assumptions about the structure of worship. These are independent issues (although not completely unconnected). The question is about the theology which informs our understanding of the relation of liturgy to the world which is claimed for Christ’s sovereignty by those who worship. Nor is it a matter of tailoring liturgy to the interests or abilities of a mostly non-worshipping public (Prayer Book Mattins as an acceptable cultural activity for the educated unbeliever or half-believer).

The curious accusation that liturgical reform has turned the Church of England into a ‘eucharistic’ sect and cut it off from the public life of the nation is ironic in the light of the fact that it is the Communion Orders of 1549, 1552 and 1662 that most clearly set out the ‘public’ and social dimension of belonging in the Body of Christ, since it is precisely at the Lord’s Table that the congregation is called to answer for the life of the community. Nor is it a matter of overloading the liturgy with exhortations to good behaviour or social justice at the expense of giving glory to God, but of finding words to express how the pressure of that glory is, concretely, the formation of a community whose corporate life points to the Kingdom, to God’s world made whole.

I am uncomfortably aware of not being either a liturgiologist or an active composer of liturgies: but this encourages me to indulge in a few irresponsible suggestions which there is little risk of anyone taking too seriously. If one is going to complain in abstruse terms about the shortcomings of liturgy, one is going to be asked, sooner or later, what ought to be done. So I venture these reflections on possible ways of doing justice to what I believe to be a central part of the historic Anglican understanding of liturgy.

[i] We need a penitential rite at the Eucharist which will focus our attention on specific offences against the Body of Christ. The 1662 invitation to confession requires a resolve to mutual charity and implies, following the rubric and the Exhortations, a resolve to practical reconciliation. We do not have to hurry. An invitation to confession should be able to put some flesh on why we need to confess as we come to the Lord’s Supper. I know that primitive eucharistic rites are very short on liturgical material, but that’s because primitive eucharistic worshippers could take for granted a penitential practice far more draconian than anything we dream of today.

Just as, de facto, the Eucharist has become the chief context for expository and doctrinal teaching, so, de facto, it is the place where most Christians will learn about their answerability to God. At least for Sundays and major celebrations, we should have a more extended penitential rite, which sets before us positively the requirements of the Kingdom and negatively the particular individual and corporate sins that betray the vision of the Kingdom. Increasingly (outside the world of official liturgies), people are composing good and varied penitential litanies — a form which seems increasingly to recommend itself to contemporary worshippers; a good modern Communion Order might well offer a choice of these.

[ii] The Byzantine liturgy customarily uses the Beatitudes as the third antiphon before the procession of the Book of the Gospels (the ‘Little Entrance’), introducing them with the prayer of the Good Thief from St Luke (‘Remember me when you come into your kingdom’). This usage of the Beatitudes (from Matthew 5) in liturgy has found a place in the worship of Taizé. Is it feasible to introduce it into our eucharistic worship as part of the evocation of the life of the Kingdom?

[iii] Connected with (ii): can we put some content into what the Eucharistic Prayer says about the Church? As things stand, we have no real narrative in the Preface to tell us about the history of the covenant (so that the ‘new covenant’ mentioned later is left psychologically stranded).

Ever since the first Anglican Prayer Book followed and intensified the Western tradition of curtailing material before the Sanctus, we have been deprived of an opportunity to say something solid about the continuity of God’s saving work (compare almost any Eastern rite at this point), specifically about how that work creates a community under God’s law and finally the community of the law of Christ, and how the covenant with one group is a sign of hope in speaking of God’s promised commitment to the whole human world, and, indeed, the entire creation. We need, in other words, to say more fully what’s
people for your own possession' is supposed to mean — not by way of the exposition of an idea, but by putting the notion in a context where it will be more than a rather artificial tag. This is certainly a place where we can say something about the relation of Church and Kingdom, about the horizon of the Church's life.

Many traditions recite the elements of the story of God's action with us after the Sanctus, where, as in the Preface, recent English texts are remarkably slight, giving the unmistakable impression that any interesting or worthwhile (worth celebrating) action of God begins with the incarnation (or perhaps even the passion). What has happened to Abraham and Moses? The third and fourth of the Roman Eucharistic Prayers (especially the fourth) do something towards maintaining the narrative element, and thus the universal horizon of our talking about the Church, and so do some of the American drafts, especially the supplementary orders currently (1990) in experimental use. The Church of England and the rest of the Anglican Communion should be taking this to heart. To make this point is not, as sometimes suggested, to cling to the vestiges of an outdated theory of salvation history: simply to recognize that the raison d'être of the Church is completely unintelligible without reference to Israel and to the eschatological gathering of all peoples which the election of Israel promises ('a light to the nations'). That is to say, unless we grasp that the characteristic form of God's dealing with us is the formation of a community that manifests the possibility of human healing and justice, and directs the world to the praise of its maker, we shall not see why there is a Eucharist community there at all: the worshipping congregation will be cut off from the pattern of God's 'mission' in the world, and will look like a contingent gathering of individuals who have religious interests. Although 1662 (and its predecessors) have no such material in the Eucharistic Prayer proper, the earlier parts of the rite have made abundantly clear that this assembly is not a 'contingent' gathering of this sort; there is certainly a serious dearth of reference to the first covenant (no provision for an Old Testament lesson), unless we count the Ten Commandments as such, but there is no unclarity at all about the 'communal' effect of the divine act of invitation.

So: somewhere in the 'liturgy of the Eucharist', as we are now, oddly, supposed to call the latter part of the Order, somewhere after the Offertory, we ought to be talking about covenant — about the creation of a people by God's act, a people not just boldly 'for his own possession', but called as a sign of promise to the human race. We need words to tell us about God's faithfulness to the divine promise as shown in the history of the Jewish people as well as the history of the Church so that we may confidently look forward to that of which the eucharistic assembly is the foretaste. And perhaps we need, in the concluding section of the Eucharistic Prayer, some fuller petitions about this, a little spelling out of 'gather into one in your Kingdom' in terms that go beyond the immediate worshipping assembly.

(iv) Why not a re-writing of one or more of the Exhortations? Not necessarily for public use in the liturgy, since there is an obvious risk in a didactic interruption or division of the service, evidently rather differently conceived now from what it was in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but as a general statement setting out the responsibility entailed in responding to God's gracious invitation. The second Exhortation of 1662, based ultimately on a composition of Peter Martyr's, has stood the test of time well, and might be worth reworking along with some material from the first Exhortation; or there might be a case for a wholly new composition. I realize that this is a very long shot indeed, but, as I have said, I am simply making irresponsible suggestions.

(v) My final suggestion is again not necessarily for regular public use, but might have some ecumenical import as well as some pertinence for major events in the congregation's life. The post-communion sections of our liturgies have been abridged almost to vanishing point. It has been argued that a thanksgiving for communion should be brief and business-like, since the receiving of communion is itself a sufficient commissioning and benediction, and should appropriately be left as the manifest climax of the rite. There is something in this, but the result has been a quite widespread sense of abruptness or perfunctoriness in the conclusion of the liturgy. So what about a prayer drawing on something like the Methodist Covenant Service, expressing the mission of individual and community in the world?!

Conclusion

It might be that, if all these proposals were (by some wild chance) realized, the resulting liturgy would seem to insist too much on the wider social or communitarian implications of the life of the Body. But would it? We are in no danger, on present showing, of any excess of reference to this dimension, and we need, I believe, a rather strong corrective to shake us out of the recurrent danger of talking liturgically as if we were a community of abstract subjects, constituted only by our identity as worshippers. And the Book of Common Prayer shows us that it is possible to construct a morally weighty and concretely anchored liturgical style without compromising the purpose of the
liturgy in giving glory to God. To offer God ‘ourselves, our souls and bodies’ as our ‘liturgy’ means primarily, of course, to offer what we have become in Christ; but what we become in Christ is not something existing in a space outside the particular networks and histories of which we are part. Our ‘spiritual’ or ‘reasonable’ service to God should not departicularize us, make us discernate or non-historical.

The Communion Orders of 1549, 1552 and 1662 show clearly how one might try to give glory to the eternal God very consciously as citizens of a specific place, as members of this historical polity. If we are confident that Anglicanism in general and Anglican liturgy in particular have by the grace of God something to offer in the development of self-discovery of the Catholic Church at large, we should be willing to go on working at our liturgy with these historic attempts in mind. We can see in retrospect how the effort to speak concretely and not abstractly of worshipping persons was disastrously entangled with a set of mediaeval or ‘Constantinian’ assumptions about unity and authority transferred to the nation-state; we have learned that this is a risky task.

But relating the eucharistic congregation to the history of the covenant community, to the empirical communities which in practice constitute the daily identity of worshippers, and to the eschatological community of all tribes and peoples before God and the Lamb is something in itself quite different from sacralizing the existing order of a nation or the self-sufficient identity of an ethnic group. Along with repenting the ludicrous and tragic chauvinisms of Anglican history, we should be asking what theological edge lies buried and blunted in this muddled story.

The piety of the first Exhortation and what it represents is not something we need to be ashamed of. And, if I can be allowed a concluding more-than-ever-unscientific postscript, I would be inclined to say that a recovery of confidence in the making of Anglican liturgy is imperative, at a time when so much liturgical reconstruction is liable to be bogged down in archaeologism, political horse-trading, and occasional ‘hobbity’ [a fascination for the quaint and folklorique, on the grounds of supposed antiquity and/or catholicity]. Some of this energy is pretty badly needed elsewhere in tackling the question of how Christians are to articulate in praise, repentance and intercession their accountability to the norms of God’s Kingdom against the background of the communities in which their human identity is being shaped and tested. After all, no-one else seems interested or equipped to articulate the accountability of political society to something beyond itself.

This essay was originally delivered in Holy Trinity Church, Guildford, on Saturday 16 June 1990, as the second annual Walter Boulton Lecture.
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